

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 88 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 3, 6, 10 to 12, 15, 21 to 23, 26, 30 to 32, 35, 41 to 43, 46, 50 to 52, 55, 61 to 63, 66, 78 to 80 and 83 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 4, 5, 7 to 9, 13, 14, 16 to 20, 24, 25, 27 to 29, 33, 34, 36 to 40, 44, 45, 47 to 49, 53, 54, 56 to 60, 64, 65, 67 to 77, 79, 81, 82, and 84 to 88 stand rejected as obvious.

Applicant(s) have amended the description to properly reflect the status of the U.S. Patent Applications cited therein.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 18, 21, 23, 27, 30, 38, 41, 43, 47, 50, 58, 61, 63, 75, 78 and 86 are amended. Claims 1, 21, 41, and 61 are amended to clarify that the operations are all performed on the same device. The amendments are supported for example at least by Fig. 59. Claims 10, 30, 50, and 58 are amended to clarify that the operations are all performed on the same device. The amendments are supported for example at least by Fig. 59. The remaining claims are amended to correct antecedent basis informalities.

Claims 1 to 3, 6, 10 to 12, 15, 21 to 23, 26, 30 to 32, 35, 41 to 43, 46, 50 to 52, 55, 61 to 63, 66, 78 to 80 and 83 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,744, hereinafter referred to as Murphy.

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of Claims 1, 21, 41, and 61. The rejection relied upon Murphy, Col. 3, lines 35-36, Col. 4, lines 1 to 7, Col. 5, lines 55 to 60, Col. 6, lines 46, 47, 50 to 54, and 56 to 61, and Col. 7, lines 26 to 28. Col. 3, lines 35, 36 describes a request sent to a server by a client and a smart card interface module returned to the client. Col. 4, lines 1 to 7 described assigning a smart card to a network user and

messages from the network interrogating the smart card for authentication. Note the direction is from the network to the smart card. Col. 5, lines 55 to 60 describe distribution of a smart card by a certified authority and information put on the smart card by that authority and the user. The cited lines in Col. 6 describe operations performed by a server. Col. 7, lines 26 to 28 describe data that can be retrieved from a smart card.

Thus, a conglomeration of client actions, server action and information on a smart card was cited as teaching exactly the invention recited in these claims. However, the operations recited in these claims occur on a single device and not multiple devices as cited in the rejection. Therefore, Murphy fails to anticipate these claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 1, 21, 41, and 61.

Claims 2, 3 and 6 depend from Claim 1. Claims 22, 23, and 26 depend from Claim 21. Claims 42, 43 and 46 depend from Claim 41. Claims 62, 63, and 66 depend from Claim 61. Thus, each of these claims distinguishes over Murphy for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which it depends. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2, 3, 6, 22, 23, 26, 42, 43, 46, 62, 63 and 66.

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of Claims 10, 30, 50, and 78. The rejection relied upon Murphy, Col. 3, lines 35-36, Col. 4, lines 1 to 5, Col. 5, lines 55 to 60, Col. 6, lines 1 to 11, 43 to 49, 50 to 54, and 56 to 61, and Col. 7, lines 26 to 28. Col. 3, lines 35, 36 describes a request sent to a server by a client and a smart card interface module returned to the client. Col. 4, lines 1 to 5 described assigning a smart card to a network user and messages from the network interrogating the smart card for authentication. Note the direction is from the

network to the smart card. Col. 5, lines 55 to 60 describe distribution of a smart card by a certified authority and information put on the smart card by that authority and the user. The cited lines in Col. 6, lines 1 to 11 describe actions on a client terminal and a secure gateway server. Lines 43 through 55 describe operations performed by the server. Lines 56 to 61 describe actions by a user. Col. 7, lines 26 to 28 describe data that can be retrieved from a smart card.

Again, a conglomeration of client actions, user actions, server actions and information on a smart card was cited as teaching exactly the invention recited in these claims. However, the operations recited in these claims occur on a single device and not multiple devices as cited in the rejection. Therefore, Murphy fails to anticipate these claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 10, 30, 50, and 78.

Claims 11, 12 and 15 depend from Claim 10. Claims 31, 32, and 35 depend from Claim 30. Claims 51, 52 and 55 depend from Claim 50. Claims 79, 80, and 83 depend from Claim 78. Thus, each of these claims distinguishes over Murphy for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which it depends. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 11, 12, 15, 31, 32, 35, 51, 52, 55, 79, 80 and 83.

Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, 44, 45, 53, 54, 56, 64, 65, 81, 82, and 84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,083,095. Assuming the combination of references is correct, the additional information relied upon from the secondary reference fails to correct the deficiencies of Murphy, as noted above, with respect to the independent claims from which these claims depend, and incorporated herein by

reference. Therefore, each of Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, 44, 45, 53, 54, 56, 64, 65, 81, 82, and 84 distinguishes over the combination of references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, 44, 45, 53, 54, 56, 64, 65, 81, 82, and 84.

Claims 7, 18, 27, 38, 47, 58, 75, and 86 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,601,173. Assuming the combination of references is correct, the additional information relied upon from the secondary reference fails to correct the deficiencies of Murphy, as noted above, with respect to the independent claims from which these claims depend, and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, each of Claims 7, 18, 27, 38, 47, 58, 75, and 86 distinguishes over the combination of references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 7, 18, 27, 38, 47, 58, 75, and 86.

Claims 8, 19, 28, 39, 48, 59, 76, and 87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Steven W. Disbrow, "Use cookies to maintain state in Web applications," Active Server Developer's Journal, Vol. 4, Issue 9, pg. 7,3 Louisville, KY (Sept. 2000). Assuming the combination of references is correct, the additional information relied upon from the secondary reference fails to correct the deficiencies of Murphy, as noted above, with respect to the independent claims from which these claims depend, and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, each of Claims 8, 19, 28, 39, 48, 59, 76, and 87 distinguishes over the combination of references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 8, 19, 28, 39, 48, 59, 76, and 87.

Claims 9, 20, 29, 40, 49, 60, 77, and 88 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in

view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156905. Assuming the combination of references is correct, the additional information relied upon from the secondary reference fails to correct the deficiencies of Murphy, as noted above, with respect to the independent claims from which these claims depend, and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, each of Claims 9, 20, 29, 40, 49, 60, 77, and 88 distinguishes over the combination of references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 9, 20, 29, 40, 49, 60, 77, and 88.

Claims 68 to 74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of an unstated Official Notice. Assuming that both the use of Official Notice, without declaring such notice, and the combination of references is correct, the additional information relied upon from the secondary reference fails to correct the deficiencies of Murphy, as noted above, with respect to the independent claims from which these claims depend, and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, each of Claims 68 to 74 distinguishes over the combination of references. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 68 to 74.

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

Appl. No. 10/687,488


Amdt. dated April 27, 2007

Reply to Office Action of January 29, 2007

Claims 1 to 88 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 18, 21, 23, 27, 30, 38, 41, 43, 47, 50, 58, 61, 63, 75, 78 and 86 have been amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 27, 2007.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

April 27, 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880